

REMARKS

Claims 4-8 are pending in the application, and are rejected. Claims 4 and 8 are herein amended. No new matter has been entered.

Objections to the Specification

There is no objection to the specification. However, Applicants note that on page 19, lines 13-14 indicate that “In FIG. 8, reference numeral 24 designates a housing...” Applicants note that there is shown no housing 24 in FIG. 8, but there is one in FIG. 9. Applicants herein amend the specification to refer to the correct drawing.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) because the Examiner notes that shield plate of claim 8 is not explicitly shown.

We note that the specification initially mentions shield plates on page 5, line 4. The specification further describes shield plates on page 19, line 25 to page 20, line 1. Applicants note that the shield plate is shown in FIG. 7. Applicants present herewith a replacement drawing sheet for FIG. 7 that includes reference numeral 25 indicating the shield plate. Applicants further amend the specification to properly refer to the reference label.

Objections to the Claims

Claim 8 is objected to because the limitation “each shield plate” lacks proper antecedent basis. Applicants herein amend the claim to refer to “a shield plate” instead of “the shield plate.”

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamarauskas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,929) in view of Wu (U.S. Patent No. 6,447,340).

Applicants herein amend claim 4 to more clearly define the invention. Thereafter, Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection because not all of the claimed elements are taught or suggested by the cited reference.

Applicants note that the claimed engaging projection for latching and supporting an engaging portion of an engaging lever of a plug engages the wire plug and not the plug housing as in the cited reference.

The invention of Kamarauskas et al. is entirely different from that of the characteristic part for the present invention. That is because in the engaging portion formed at the opening portion in Kamarauskas et al. projections stick out from the inner circumference of the opening to the inner side thereof.

On that point, as the present invention is comprised that “an opening wall as itself of the front end opening portion of plug loading slots functions as an engaging projection for latching and supporting an engaging portion of an engaging lever of a plug to be inserted”, no projection is formed on the inner circumference of the opening.

Applicants direct the attention of the Examiner to attached FIGS. 1 and 2, which have had notations added by hand showing the present claimed above features, as herein amended.)

Therefore, because not all of the claimed elements are taught or suggested by the cited reference, Applicants submit that the rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 5, Applicants submit that because claim 4 has been patentably distinguished from the cited references, and claim 5 depends from claim 4 and necessarily

includes at least its limitations, claim 5 has been patentably distinguished from the cited reference as well.

Furthermore, with respect to Wu, Applicants admit that there disclosed that the distance between a ground contact and their corresponding contact is smaller than the distance between a signal contact corresponding contact.

However, in Wu there is no suggestion of a structure that in order to prevent a test finger from contacting positive side (positive polarity) terminals, the positive polarity terminals are positioned further back than the opening portion 21 in speaker terminals of the present invention. That is a reason why the contacts 32 and 30 in Wu are disposed on the outer portion of the open housing 2. While in Wu the number of contacts (terminals) is a large number, the speaker terminals in the present invention have only two terminals for every channel, a pair of terminals, positive polarity and negative polarity. There would be no reason for the terminal of Wu to have the present configuration, and therefore one would not have looked to Wu to reach the present invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamarauskas et al. in view of Wu as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Hung et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,264,501). The Examiner asserts that Kamarauskas et al. in view of Wu substantially discloses the claimed invention except for the plug loading slots being colored separately. The Examiner notes that Hung et al. discloses connectors being labeled with different colors, and concludes that to color the plug loading slots of Kamarauskas et al. with different colors would have been obvious to prevent insertion of incorrect plugs.

With respect to claim 7, Applicants submit that because claim 4 has been patentably distinguished from the cited references, and claim 7 depends from claim 4 and necessarily

Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No. 021091A
Serial No. 10/776,258

includes at least its limitations, claim 7 has been patentably distinguished from the cited reference as well.

Furthermore, Applicants note that the features of claim 7 of the present invention prevent erroneous connections among channels by coloring speaker terminals to distinguish them in color for every channel. Because all of the speaker terminals for every channel are formed on the opening portion with the same shape in the present invention, any of the plugs of speaker cables for any channels can be inserted into the speaker terminals, and in case the plug is inadvertently inserted by mistake for an incorrect channel, the speaker gives out a sound but it does not emit a desired stereophonic sound. The distinctive color for the present invention prevents such. The distinction in color for the Hung is to distinguish the different types of connectors and so the distinction in Hung is different from that in color for every channel of the speaker terminals in the invention.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No. 021091A
Serial No. 10/776,258

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Kenneth H. Salen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,077
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

KHS/lde

Enclosures: Replacement drawing sheet for Fig. 7
FIGS. 1 and 2 including hand notations